DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 356 EA 017 854

AUTHOR Hord, Shirley M.
TITLE Collaboration or Cooperation: Comparisons and Contrasts, Dilemmas and Decisions.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO R&DCTE-R-3203
PUB DATE Jan 85
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Meadow Brook Symposium on Collaborative Action Research in Education (Oakland University, January 1985).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *Cooperation; Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation; *Institutional Cooperation; Interpersonal Relationship; *Models
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Research

ABSTRACT

This report discusses collaboration and cooperation in the field of education, describing them as distinctly different operational processes between either individuals or organizations, with each mode requiring different kinds of input and each yielding different sorts of returns. Based on these premises, the report attempts to briefly answer the following questions: How are collaboration and cooperation different? What requirements can be expected when using each model? What are the subsequent rewards? and What is the value of distinguishing between them? In the main section, the literature is explored on the topic of concepts and paradigms of individual, organizational, and interorganizational behavior. Also reviewed are the reports of agencies and institutions that "cooperated," "coordinated," "collaborated," or "consorted." Another section compares and contrasts collaboration and cooperation, using 10 categories. A third section further refines these definitions into preliminary models for explicating the process of cooperation and collaboration. A 25-item reference list is provided. (DCS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED258356

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# Collaboration or Cooperation:
# Comparisons and Contrasts
# Dilemmas and Decisions

Shirley M. Hord

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

R&D Report No. 3203

Meadow Brook Symposium
on Collaborative Action Research
in Education
Oakland University
January, 1985

EA 017 854

# Collaboration or Cooperation: Comparisons and Contrasts Dilemmas and Decisions

Shirley M. Hord
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Collaboration reflects and is embedded in a trend in American education that assumes that groups of institutions, agencies and community representatives acting together are more effective in solving the complex problems of American education than if independent and unilateral actions are taken (Houston, 1979). Trist (1977) succinctly stated this sentiment:

> Since the (present social system) has become interdependent on a scale hitherto unknown, this has the implication that collaboration, for the individual and organization alike, has acquired primacy over competition.

The importance of individuals and institutions working together to solve problems and to improve practice is widely lauded but implementation is frequently not practical.

The idea of collaboration is not a new one. For the past twenty years, educational institutions have been strongly encouraged to collaborate. Almost everyone seems to agree that collaboration is a good idea and is an activity that should be undertaken. Collaboration among institutions and individuals in the field of education has been encouraged in a number of ways. The Higher Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-329) encouraged cooperation between higher education and other agencies and between developing institutions and established ones. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10) required schools to collaborate with other institutions. Since then, programs such as Teacher Corps and Teacher Centers have emphasized collaboration as an approach to improving education. In recent years, funding for these types of programs has been greatly reduced, yet the directive to collaborate has

remained. This continued belief in the importance of collaboration is resulting in new attention to support collaboration between individuals and institutions.

A number of strategies have been developed to facilitate collaboration among persons in the field of education. These range from informal arrangements in which two or more parties agree to work together with no special resources, to jointly funded endeavors with explicit guidelines as to how the collaboration is to take place. In the field of research, collaborative action research was a movement to encourage researchers and teachers to work together to focus on questions related to classroom practice (Pine, 1979; Fox, 1969). A more recent movement, Interactive Research and Development, expanded the concept of collaborative action research to address questions of dissemination and implementation. Interactive research and development employs a collaborative strategy which brings teachers, researchers and staff developers together to inquire as a team into questions, problems, and concerns of classroom teachers. At the time the team is conducting research, it is also collaboratively planning means to disseminate the research findings (Tikunoff, Ward & Griffin, 1979). This strategy has been applied in various studies (Griffin, Lieberman & Jacullo-Noto, 1983; Huling, 1983; Pine and Oja, 1983).

While there is apparently little argument about the need for or value of collaboration, there is a fair amount of disagreement about what "counts" as collaboration. For the past decade, the literature on the topic of collaboration has attempted to distinguish between collaboration and cooperation. Examples of this are as follows:

> Cooperation--two individuals or organizations reach some mutual agreement, but their work together does not progress beyond this level.
> Collaboration--development of the model of joint planning, joint implementation and joint evaluation between individuals or organizations

(New England Program in Teacher Education, 1973).
Collaboration is a term that implies the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making... Cooperation, on the other hand, is a term that assumes two or more parties, each with separate and autonomous programs, agree to work together in making all such programs more successful (Hoyt, 1976). Both cooperate and collaborate emphasize work and both emphasize working with others. Cooperation includes as a defined purpose that the association is for mutual benefit. Collaboration is concerned with intellectual endeavors (e.g., literary, artistic, or scientific work) (Houston, 1979).

The concept [collaboration] has seemingly been prostituted, as any and many relationships are labeled as collaboration. How many organizations or individuals are suffering delusions of collaboration? One has to wonder what behaviors are hiding under the cloak of collaboration (Ford, 1980b).

Undoubtedly there have been instances in the past when cooperative endeavors have been mislabeled as collaborative; there is certainly a need to distinguish between the goals and expectations of collaborative and cooperative endeavors. Frequently, however, differentiating the two has resulted in an assessment that collaboration is clearly the more meritorious endeavor, while cooperation, on the other hand, is somehow relegated to the status of "second-class citizen." Clearly both collaboration and cooperation are important relationships and neither approach is superior for all situations which involve individuals and institutions working together. Different situations require different approaches and all parties need to clearly specify their expectations of what is to be accomplished through the relationship, whether it be collaborative or cooperative.

The author holds the premise that collaboration and cooperation, as descriptions of operational processes between either individuals or organizations, are distinctly different. Each mode requires different kinds of input and each yields different sorts of return. Given this premise, questions to be asked are: how are they different; what requirements can be expected when using each model; what are the subsequent rewards; and, not to be

overlooked, what is the value in distinguishing between them?

This paper briefly addresses these questions. The basic issue of whether or not collaboration is different from cooperation was confronted earlier as the result of the analysis and synthesis of events in a case study on the "collaborative process" (Hord, 1980a). Because of different connotations people attributed to the words, expectations of what they meant as operational processes varied greatly within the same "collaborative project." Some people used the terms interchangeably, while others attributed very different qualities to the processes. Overall, while the participants' opinion was that the project had failed as a collaborative effort, they conceded that cooperation had occurred.

The case study supports the author's premise that the success of a collaborative venture depends to a great extent on its clear definition of expectations by all parties involved, and a consequent agreement of the goal to be shared which will direct the process to its mutual conclusion. Without these two elements, true collaboration will not likely occur. Collaboration is not possible without cooperation, but the inverse is not true. Collaboration requires a great deal more effort, but ideally yields more. Cooperation is possible with less effort because it does not require shared goals, although it can be done more smoothly when expectations are clear. Collaboration and cooperation are both valued models, each serving a unique purpose, but in order to choose the appropriate model for the situation, their differences and their requirements should be understood. This paper offers a beginning to that understanding, and offers also a "rough draft" of models for employing either the cooperative or collaborative process.

## The Literature

There has been continuing and abundant discourse about interorganizational

collaboration and interagency behavior pursuant to shared goals. With decreasing resources, and increasing complexity of organizations, social structures and society-at-large, there is a growing need for increasing interactions which are cooperative or collaborative. In an exploration into the literature regarding the topics of collaborative and cooperative efforts several areas of the literature were sampled: concepts and paradigms of individual, organizational and interorganizational behavior, to gain a global view of the scholarly perspective on individuals and groups working together; and reports of agencies and institutions which "cooperated," "coordinated," "collaborated," or "consorted" in order to gain some understanding of the practitioner's point of view.

## Concepts of Interrelationships

The content reported here on the theory and operation of individuals' and organizations' relationships by no means represents the totality of concepts and models in this field. Yet, this cursory selection of material offers some constructive input regarding working relationships.

Basic to the study of organizations and their activities is the study of the individuals of which the group is comprised. Individuals are

> joined together in groups, small and large, and they interact in these groups both as individuals and as groups ... an individual cannot exist in isolation, but only in relation to other individuals and groups (Miller & Rice, 1967, p. 14).

Thus, a theory of human behavior -- in addition to a theory of systems of activities -- is a requisite for a theory of organization. Miller and Rice further suggest that "individuals and groups, however, have the capacity to mobilize themselves at different times into many different kinds of activity systems..." (p. 14). Therefore, it would seem that the discrete consideration

of individuals within the relating organizations, with pertinent attention to each individual and his capacity to "mobilize" himself into action, is an important corollary to assessing a group's capability for movement.

In a discussion of the benefits that scientists perceived in working in collaboration with other scholars rather than as a single investigator, Fox and Faver (1984) identified four motivations: joining resources and dividing labor, alleviating academic isolation, sustaining motivation through commitments to the other collaborator and the creation of energy through the interpersonal relationship to complete projects. The disadvantages or costs of collaborating were organized by Fox and Faver in two categories. One was process costs: time for negotiation and exchange; various expenses of telephone, mail, travel; and the personal investment needed to sustain the collaboration. The second was outcome costs including possible delays or loss of the project, evaluation problems and allocation of project credit, and possible quality loss.

The positive consequences for these scientists in engaging in collaboration meant large projects could become possible, a "collective creativity" could be generated, and scientific research efficiency could be increased. Negatively, collaboration could inhibit individual creativity, it could hinder the verification of study findings, threaten the monitoring system of research that is done by peers, and could increase the opportunities for fraud.

In reflecting on the collaboration of two education researchers, Hannay and Stevens (1984) specified important aspects that contributed to their collaboration. First, both the researchers were actively and equally involved with no one partner taking a dominant role. Another asset was that each of the persons, coming from a different role and perspective, appreciated the role and

perspective of the other. Both formulated the research questions, and decisions and analyses were conducted jointly, leading to a "meeting of the minds" (page 3), a mutual enterprise. Hannay and Stevens further state that each must be willing to contribute time and "bracket their respective egos" (p. 3); both must wish to be involved in collaboration and have the skills to achieve it. "Both parties must seriously and mutually reflect on how the collaborative nature of the project will be accomplished" (page 13). These initial conditions, they maintain, are required for collaboration to occur. Finally, the authors reiterate that collaboration must not be taken lightly since it is demanding and should be given serious reflection.

In examining groups linked in mutual endeavor, Van de Ven (1976) defined an interorganizational relationship (IR) as having taken place

> when two or more organizations transact resources among each other. ...An IR is defined as a social action system on the premise that it exhibits the basic elements of any organized form of collective behavior.
>
> 1. Behavior among members is aimed at attaining collective and self-interest goals.
>
> 2. Interdependent processes emerge through division of tasks and functions among members.
>
> 3. An IR can act as a unit and has a unique identity separate from its members.

According to Van de Ven, this relationship can be studied

> in terms of structure (formalization, centralization and complexity), process (direction and intensity of resource and information flows) and ends (perceived effectiveness of the inter-agency relationships) (p. 28).

Schermerhorn (1975) noted the growing literature of interorganizational analysis and bemoaned the lack of studies on cooperation. On the basis of a review of the literature, he suggested motivators which influence interorganizational cooperation:

> Organizations will seek out or be receptive to interorganizational cooperation when faced with situations of resource scarcity or performance

> distress... Organizations will seek out or be receptive to interorganizational cooperation when a powerful extraorganizational force demands this activity (p. 848).

Schermerhorn summarized the potential costs to organizations for these cooperative relationships: loss of decision-making autonomy; unfavorable ramifications for organizational image or identity; or costs requiring the direct expenditure of scarce organizational resources.

Beckhard (1975) maintained that making organizational interventions will not result in change (to more cooperative or collaborative modes) that remains in operation unless the following conditions are attendant:

> a. There must be real dissatisfaction with the status quo, a high enough level of dissatisfaction to mobilize energy toward some change.
>
> b. There must be in the organizational leaders' "heads" some picture of a desired state which would be worth mobilizing appropriate energy.
>
> c. There must be in the organization leaders' "heads" a knowledge and picture of some practical first steps toward this desired state, if energy is to be mobilized to start (p. 424).

Collaboration as defined by Appley and Winder (1977) is a relational system in which:

> 1) individuals in a group share mutual aspirations and a common conceptual framework;
>
> 2) the interactions among individuals are characterized by "justice as fairness;"
>
> 3) these aspirations and conceptualizations are characterized by each individual's consciousness of his/her motives toward the other; by caring or concern for the other; and by commitment to work with the other over time provided that this commitment is a matter of choice (p. 281).

Organizations utilize "cooperative strategies" as a means for managing their interdependence with other organizations. Thompson (1967) concluded that these strategies involve various kinds of cooperation. The first is contracting, informal consensus and more formal or negotiated agreements for the future exchange of performances. Another is coopting, "the process of

absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure" (p. 35) so as to increase its stability, a more constraining kind of cooperation than contracting. The third form of cooperation is coalescing, which is the engagement of two or more organizations in a joint venture to reach goals. It provides a basis for exchange and subsumes a commitment for future decisions made jointly, an even more constraining form of cooperation than coopting.

Institutional/Organizational Relationships

There is a burgeoning body of literature emanating from the field of education as institutions and agencies engage in working relationships in a variety of modes. Intriligator (1982) in "The Collaborative Option," asserts that regional education agencies are best suited to accomplish school improvement by making cooperative arrangements with other educational organizations. In discussing these arrangements, the terms cooperative and collaborative appear to be used interchangeably to refer to the interorganizational relationships. Intriligator (1983) suggests that interorganizational relationships may be called collaboratives, cooperatives, coalitions and consortia and all of these arrangements occur when "two or more independent organizations agree to pool their authority, resources and energies in order to achieve a goal or goals they desire" (page 5).

Intriligator has created an analytic framework to be used for considering the effectiveness of interorganizational relations. These indicators, it would seem, could be used also for planning and implementing such relationships. The indicators are divided into four groups: one, prior organizational situations which include potential resources, an environment that is cooperative, and goal congruence between members and the interorganization; two, structural characteristics which involve coordinating mechanisms, demographic conditions and contributions of resources; third, relational characteristics that support

the involvement of individuals in multiple complex organizational ties; and fourth, process characteristics such as the amount of formality, the process of exchange, and patterns of influence and authority power.

Other reports come from the experiences of institutions of higher education working with public schools for some mutual objective. In an early report entitled "A Tale of Dichotomous Desires," Metzner (1970) stated that, in the past, university and school joint ventures failed because of differing aims and objectives of education held by the two institutions. He described the lack of agreement between education professors and elementary teachers and suggested possible solutions to consider for improving the prospects for joint endeavors. For example, because the principal is identified as the key individual in joint school-university relations, selection of the principal should be on the basis of his/her understanding of the university's orientation. Furthermore, school faculty selection for the joint endeavor should be focused on change-oriented teachers who are identified by the following variables: 1) age -- young teachers are more open to change, 2) experience -- less experienced teachers are more receptive, 3) inservice training -- those persons who have had more than the required amount of training show greater readiness for change, 4) masters degree -- teachers with this higher level of education tend to be more open to innovation, 5) grade level placement -- upper elementary grade teachers are more open, whereas resistance to new procedures increases as the grade assignment decreases. A third consideration is the continual involvement of the administration, school faculty, and university personnel in all stages of planning, evaluation and decision-making.

Howey and Cannon (1978) investigated institutional relationships and focused on the structure (number of persons from each institution) and process

of collaboration in decision-making (how much each person talked, asked questions, made statements). Their conclusions reiterate the desirability of parity for each institution's representatives. Several factors contributed to process parity: group process training, experience by council members in collaborative decision-making, and an active role in meetings by the team manager.

The North Carolina Quality Assurance Program is one wherein institutions of higher education and the local public schools joined in a collaborative effort. Schaffer and Bryant (1983) report on this experience which includes a definition of collaboration, "refers to shared decision-making in governance, planning, delivery, and evaluation of programs. It is a pluralistic form of education where people of dissimilar backgrounds work together with equal status. It may be seen as working with rather than working on a person," (page 3). Benefits and impediments to collaboration were identified by the project from a review of the literature. These have been cast in generalizable terms and follow:

| Benefits | Impediments |
|---|---|
| Economic savings to both parties (Hugh, 1975). | Lack of resources available is a significant restriction to the amount of collaborative efforts possible. (Yarger, Harvey and Joyce, 1980) |
| Utilize the strengths of both parties to develop the goals. (Hugh, 1975) | There are limits to the transfer of power and resources that an organization can make or will desire to make (Byrd, 1982). |
| Involvement and ownership is central to authentic learning, therefore, the involvement of both parties is a key to collaborative work. (Howey, Bents and Corrigan, 1981) | Often "the decision-making process and impetus for change is external to the institution" (Roth, p. 3). |
| Enhancing outcomes by including perspectives of both parties (Herring and Howey, 1982). | There is a lack of conceptual framework to organize parties effectively (Yarger, et al, 1980). |
| **Benefits** | **Impediments** |
| Informs participants of others | Each of the parties has structures |

| | |
|---|---|
| perspectives (Herring and Howey, 1982) | different from the other (Weaver, 1981) |
| Improved communication between the two parties (Weiss, 1976). | Lack of skills in cooperative decision-making (Yarger, et al, 1981). |
| | There is a poor match between what one party has to offer and what the other needs (Yarger, et al, 1981). |

Participants in the Quality Assurance Program were surveyed to elicit their attitudes about collaboration's benefits and impediments

| Benefits | Impediments |
|---|---|
| Increased practical aspects of teacher education | Lack of time |
| Increased sharing of resources | Lack of financial support |
| Increased communication | Overburden agencies with planning, implementing and/or evaluating for collaboration |
| Increased consensus on educational goals | |

Collaboration appears to have something for everybody but it is difficult to achieve. The literature suggests that "collaboration is necessary and valuable, but that it occurs only in special settings or in unusual circumstances" (p. 6).

Additional Ideas

In an offering by Lanier (1979), the distinction between cooperation and collaboration was described. Using the metaphor of the family, a mother cooperates with her son by allowing and encouraging his rock band to practice in their home. The daughter cooperates with the mother by preparing hors d'oeuvres for the mother's guests. These efforts are cooperative; the activities are mutually agreeable but not for mutual benefit

The family collaborates in a family meal preparation; they each "offer some form of expertise that is rewarding to all... (which) contributes to the well-being of the whole group" (p. 408). Lanier's ideas provide a helpful

point in distinguishing cooperation and collaboration and for clearly defining what each one means in terms of a description for an interactive process.

In cooperation, activities are mutually agreeable but not necessarily for mutual benefit. Another metaphor may help: dating is a cooperative venture, while marriage is a collaborative one. Certainly some marriages never attain true collaborative status, but the general consensus assumes marriage to be a different way of relating than when the individuals were separate. Marriage counselors would probably agree that many unsuccessful relationships can be attributed to unclear or unmatched expectations by parties involved. Similarly, the "marriage" of two organizations, although temporary by definition, assumes a mutual goal. If, however, the assumed goals are not the same, "divorce" is inevitable. Should the same two organizations opt for a cooperative venture, an entirely different level of commitment is required, and the goals of each partner need not comply with the other for both to be fulfilled. Furthermore, the individual goals could conceivably be competitive, but the cooperation still be a success. A football game requires cooperation by both teams to stage the event, but the teams have a definitely competitive goal.

Houston (1979) reported that

> the paucity of research on collaboration is astounding. The literature is filled with case studies and observations... (describing) conditions, designs, and dreams. Very few even attempt to analyze their operations (p. 333).

Houston cited the need for research which would address such complex aspects of collaboration as the structure of collaborative enterprises (organization, governance, management structure), problems of communication at all levels within and between institutions, and support and reward systems for the individuals involved in the group effort.

Houston offered hypotheses derived from the literature, from his own experience and from common "lore." Examples of these are that 1) collaborative relationships are more likely to grow from successful previous experiences, 2) goals which are clear and mutually held will aid collaboration, 3) achieving short-term goals will encourage a positive view and encourage progress, and 4) assumptions and decisions in a collaboration seem to come out of personal experience. Such hypotheses need testing. Clearly, there is a lack of research and a need for studies which would provide insight and shed light on this relationship.

## Comparisons and Contrasts

Following is an identification of salient features of the complex collaborative process contrasted with the apparently more simple cooperative process. The ten areas emerged as the literature, personal experience and common sense were consulted. Although these ten areas are part of either process, they are defined here in terms of the demands of collaboration, as that is the process currently the focus of attention by agencies of all disciplines and highly recommended as the most appropriate mode for interorganizational relationships:

1. Needs and Interests. The extent to which organizations share interests and needs beforehand will be a major determinant to their propensity to work together. There must be a sense of gain for each in joining together; and when gain is mutual and interest is sufficiently heightened, collaboration is possible.

2. Time. Participants must be willing to devote the necessary time to joint endeavors. A much greater amount of time is required for collaboration than for cooperation, since activities are shared rather than allowed. Many

participants are engaged in many mutual activities; unilateral action, which is efficient in terms of time, is not effective for collaborative efforts.

3. Energy. Collaboration requires effort. Reaching-out, action-taking individuals are needed for the impetus to begin and to sustain the collaborative spirit. These kinds of people should be given key roles in the interchange to maintain a bonding.

4. Communication. Large and small group meetings are an ongoing requirement. Frequent interactions at all levels across both organizations are a necessity. The collaborating mode is a sharing one, and sharing is grounded in continuing communication.

5. Resources. Collaborating organizations share funds, staff, and other resources. Generally, an effort requiring more staff time and energy will be more expensive. The rewards, or expected outcomes, must be worth the investment to each participant.

6. Organizational Factors. While the organizations are the framework, the people within them are doing the actual work. An organization which pulls together internally is more ready to work with others outside the organization. Certain critical persons can enhance or impede the collaborative process. Collaborating individuals within an organization promote similar activities between the organizations. These people need to be identified early and given appropriate roles.

7. Control. When participants are willing to relinquish personal control and assume more risk, they create a more flexible environment, and can move closer to collaboration. Control must be shared and a tolerance for plasticity must be fostered. For people or organizations needing stability, specificity and control, collaboration is a difficult process -- the cooperative model is more suitable.

8. Perceptions. Taking the pulse or checking the perceptions of others involved contributes to the collaborating climate. It is vital for individuals in each organization to be willing to stand in the others' boots and view the world from that standpoint. This empathy enhances all the other points.

9. Leadership. This relates to Energy, Communication, Organizational Factors, and other points in lesser degree. Strong leadership that expresses an enthusiastic, positive example by collaborating on many levels will encourage collaboration in the organizations overall.

10. Personal Traits. "If there is any personality characteristic needed to function in the (collaborating) approach, it is probably simply, patience" (Murray & Smith, 1974). To that should be added persistence, and a willingness to share. Highly competitive, "do it myself to do it right" individuals are not predisposed to collaborative ways of operating in the world.

Obviously, these ten points leave ample room for further definition and conclusions. They are, however, a promising conceptual base upon which a more precise framework of action can be built.

## Dilemmas and Decisions

The attractive ideals of collaboration do not translate into clear action among participants. However, the author's ten-point definition provided above has been further refined into preliminary models for explicating the processes of cooperation and collaboration. The author's models are presented in Figure 1. Model A describes the Cooperative Process, while Model B describes Collaboration. This comparison is, in the author's opinion, a good beginning, a provocative preliminary model which warrants more attention in the way of both application and research.

The model is self-explanatory. One can see at a glance the vastly

Figure 1

| Model A<br>Cooperation | Model B<br>Collaboration |
|---|---|
| **Steps in Beginning Process** | |
| 1. One organization (X) approaches another (Y) and receives permission to complete a task (research, analysis, etc.) | 1. Organizations agree on an exchange of tasks, each offering the other a product or service. |
| 2. X completes their task with the help, tolerance and cooperation of Y, but without much contribution of resources from Y. | 2. Organizations join forces (personnel get together) to plan and execute the design of a shared project. A "joint staff" system develops. |
| 3. X reports to Y on their results, findings or whatever they projected as a result of their task--X develops a "product" on their own, but as a result of the cooperation of Y. | 3. Organizations agree on projected results, outcomes, products, services, etc. Shared goals are arrived at and an action plan outlined. |
| **Communication** | |
| 1. Organization X conveys information to Y at occasional intervals. X determines the nature of communication, although they also respond to requests from Y. | 1. Communication roles are established and definite channels are created for interactions across the organization concerning the joint project. Many "levels" of communication are established, as clear information is the keystone of success in the effort. |
| **Resources/Ownership** | |
| 1. Organization X provides resources and expertise, Organization Y provides access, setting, situation. | 1. Both organizations contribute staff, time, resources and capabilities. This is generally defined during planning process. |
| 2. Organization X arranges funds, may even pay Y for its contributions. | 2. Mutual funding is obtained, perhaps from an outside source, depending on nature of the institutions (private, public, non-profit, international, etc.). |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. "Us/them" process mode develops--individual proprietorship. | 3. "We" process mode develops--system ownership. |

## Requirements/Characteristics

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. A problem area is identified by X and permission obtained from Y to research and/or analyze it; OR an area of interest of X is found to be profited by some association with Y, and permission from Y is obtained to carry out that association. | 1. Both organizations expend much time and energy.<br>2. Action and risks are taken by both groups.<br>3. Many meetings, large and small, are arranged frequently.<br>4. Compromise is a necessity; various trade-offs are arranged.<br>5. A combined staff, perhaps even a staff trade or loan, comes into being.<br>6. Expertise of different kinds are contributed by each group (which is one of the primary motivations for collaboration, after all). |

## Leadership & Control

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Unilateral leadership is characteristic.<br>2. Central control continues in each organization. | 1. Dispersed leadership is characteristic.<br>2. Responsibility is delegated. Individuals must be willing to use independent judgment about assuming responsibility.<br>3. Shared, mutual control is ideal. Shared goals provide the congruity to the effort. |

## Rewards

1. Organization X gets its product. Organization Y may be able to use it. Organization Y may simply benefit from a sense of altruism, or social contribution.

1. Both organizations are able to share in a product and/or service which would not have been possible (or very researchable) as separate agents.

2. This shared product/service may be a release of a responsibility that neither one could have carried alone.

3. In the case of public service organizations the public may gain greater benefit from the joint effort than each separate organization could have offered.

4. The product of the joint endeavor can sometimes lead to a permanent relationship, opening they way for further sharing and mutual benefits.

5. Each organization can experience an expansion of possibilities without having to "spread thin."

6. Although more time/energy/resources may have been expended, very often the <u>same</u> time, energy and resources are ultimately conserved by shared effort. Duplication of services is sometimes eliminated while improving the <u>quality</u> of service.

different expectations each process evokes when clearly defined as to what it will entail. One can also immediately construe what conflicts would arise when it is not clear which model is in process--when some individuals are using A and others are expecting B. Obviously, which one is to be used must be made clear from the beginning, and everyone must know the definitions and expectations of the selected model.

It is, of course, a cursory, bare-bones outline, but sufficient for clarifying necessary procedures. Each area defined in Figure 1 can be expanded, refined, and detailed according to the particular situation. The outline provides a backbone for supporting an extended, variable mode.

It becomes more obvious as the requirements for collaboration are reviewed that the necessity for clarifying expectations of the participants is of paramount importance -- not only the expectations of rewards, but expectations of goals, of commitments from each sector, and of procedures. These decision points frequently become the critical dilemmas which force a choice of the cooperative mode rather than the more demanding collaborative one. Although there has been research on the cooperation/collaboration process, there has been little attempt to clearly define the varying degrees of requirements for the interactive processes so as to offer a guideline by which to choose the appropriate one.

Definitely, the interactive process begs to be studied further. Much of what is written is based on intuition or folklore. A great deal of additional inquiry, elaboration, and refinement needs to be done. Research that should be pursued is that which undertakes comparative studies of the various ways of interrelating: cooperation, coordination, collaboration, etc. The outcome would be the further delineation of the components of each process, with the costs and benefits of each explicated. Perhaps we would learn of different

types of each, their requirements, limitations, and which types are most effective when.

## Relevance of the Models

Both the cooperating and collaborating processes are very complex enterprises; either process requires substantial support and investment. Currently it is quite *en vogue* for interorganizational liaisons to don the trappings of some type of interactive behaviors in the guise of collaboration, which has come to be touted as the greatly preferred way to work. But the concept has seemingly been prostituted, as any and many relationships are labeled as collaboration.

Policy makers and others could find an explicit model of collaboration a useful construct in their conceptualization of interorganizational relationships. Models which provide illumination about the initial and ongoing requirements of collaboration could be informative to those who must make decisions about organizational behavior. Individuals who refer to such models would become more aware of the array of the requirements of collaboration. They may also learn that leadership roles and communication channels in the collaborative process necessitate special accommodations. Examination of experience-based models makes predetermined information on the rewards of collaborating available to the architects of policy. With such information it would be possible to select the most appropriate process to fit the individuals, goals, and resources of projected interorganizational liaisons.

## References


Appley, D. E. & Winder, A. E. (1977). An evolving definition of collaboration and some implications for the world of work. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1977, 13(3), 279-290.

Beckhard, R. (1975). Organization development in large systems. In K. D. Benne, L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb and R. O. Lippitt (Eds.), The laboratory method of changing and learning. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, Inc.

Fox, D. J. (1969). The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Fox, M. F. & Faver, C. A. (1984). Independence and cooperation in research: The motivations and costs of collaboration. Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 55, No. 3, May/June 1984.

Griffin, G. A., Lieberman, A. & Jacullo-Noto, J. (1982). Interactive Research and Development on Schooling: Final Report. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Hannay, L. M. & Stevens, K. W. (1984). The principal's world: A case study of collaborative research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Hord, S. M. (1980a). Distinguishing between cooperation and collaboration: A case study approach to understanding their relative requirements and outcomes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Hord, S. M. (1980b). Working together: Cooperation or Collaboration? The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Texas.

Houston, W. R. (1979). Collaboration - See 'treason,' In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord and G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Howey, K. & Cannon, B. (1978). The school-community council: Process and parity, involvement: A study of shared governance of teacher education. United States Office of Education.

Huling, L. L. (1983). Interactive research and development makes a difference. Action in Teacher Education, Winter 1982-83.

Intriligator, B. A. (1982). New ways of planning for new realities: The collaborative option. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Intriligator, B. A. (1983). Evaluating inter-organizational relationships. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Lanier, J. (1979). Collaboration session, discussant remarks, In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord and G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future Research. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The Univeristy of Texas.

Metzner, S. (1970). School-university partnership: A tale of dichotomous desires. Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 51(6), 328-329.

Murray, S. L. & Smith, N. L. (1974). The administrator-researcher interaction: The conduct of cooperative research. Research, Evaluation, Development Paper Series, No. 4. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Office of Research and Evaluation Services (ERIC ED 137 911).

New England Program in Teacher Education, Inc. (1973). The first five year's activities under public act 761 and public act 230 -- Review and recommendations -- A report. Durham, NH (ERIC ED 115 581).

Oja, S. N. & Pine, G. J. (1983). A Two Year Study of Teachers' Stages of Development in Relation to Collaborative Action Research in Schools: Final Report. Durham, NH: Univeristy of New Hampshire.

Pine, G. J. (1979). Collaborative action research: Teacher emancipation. New England Teacher Corps Exchange, 1979, 2(3), 3-4.

Schaffer, E. C. & Bryant, W. C. (1983). Structures and processes for effective collaboration among local schools, colleges and universities. A collaborative project of Kannapolis City Schools, Livingstone College, University of North Carolina-Charlotte.

Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr. (1975). Determinants of interorganizational cooperation. Academy of Management Journal, 1975, 18(4), 846-856.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). Organizations in action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tikunoff, W., Ward, B., & Griffin, G. (1979). Interactive research and development on teaching: Final report. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Trist, E. (1977). Collaboration in work settings: A personal perspective. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1977, 13(3), 268-278.

Van de Ven, A. H. (1976). On the nature, formation, and maintenance of relations among organizations. Academy of Management Review, 1976, 1(4), 24-36.